UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,916	09/14/2000	Takeo Hayase	02887.0190	9502

22852   7590   07/02/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
NAHAR, QAMRUN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2124	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 April 2004</u>.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-7,9,11,12 and 14-20</u> is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-7,9,11,12 and 14-20</u> is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the RCE filed on 4/21/04.

2.   Claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12 have been amended.

3.   Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 are pending.

4.   Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5.   Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Mason (U.S. 5,668,998).

Response to Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7.   Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the

subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

        Regarding claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12, the phrase "being placed on a boundary"

renders the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether it is referring to any tangible

computer element. Therefore, this phrase is interpreted as "provides an interface".

        Per claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20, these claims are rejected for dependency upon

rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mason (U.S. 5,668,998).

Per Claim 1 (Amended, as best understood):

The Mason patent discloses:

- a method for constructing a service providing system using a framework for service providing system which provides a service for an object system ("A framework of service objects is provided which enables a programmer to easily develop application methods which provide DICOM services or other custom services. An object-oriented application interface is provided. The objects provide a map between DICOM standard service objects and a group of associated objects within a framework. The associated service objects work together to provide a DICOM service. The service objects comprise a method or a computer program which operates in conformance with the DICOM standard." in column 1, lines 10-19 and column 1, lines 66-67 to column 2, lines 1-2)

- preparing a framework for service providing system, which includes a data holding part for holding data relating to an object system for which a service providing system constructed by said framework provides a service ("The present invention provides a framework of service interface objects which map onto a service described in the DICOM standard. Each service interface object, when instantiated, is uniquely associated with a user handler and a provider handler ... An implemented DICOM service, or set of objects which implement the DICOM service, is placed in the framework of objects. The DICOM service collection of objects is then available to an application programmer accessing the framework in implementing the same or a similar DICOM service." in column 2, lines 3-7 and column 7, lines 43-48; the DICOM service collection of objects is interpreted as a data holding part)

- a user interface part for receiving instructions from a user and for presenting data to the user when the user employs the constructed service providing system, the user interface part provides an interface between a computer and the user ("Turning now to Fig. 2, in a example of an operational scenario, a DTServiceInterface object 11 initiates a request. This is true for all service classes. The only difference between a verify request and one of the print requests is the particular subclass of the DTServiceInterface object that is chosen by the application developer. The outgoing message is called a "Request". ... The incoming message is called a "Confirmation". ... At this point in time, the confirmation has been received, so the transaction is considered complete. It is the responsibility of the DTServiceInterface object to look at the status that was returned. If the status was success, the DTServiceInterface object may be

cleaned up. If the status was not success, it is the responsibility of the application

developer to determine how to recover from a bad status. Any of these actions could

cause the application developer to need to create a subclass of the appropriate

DTServiceInterface class." in column 7, lines 64-67 to column 8, lines 1-3; column 8,

lines 56-67 to column 9, lines 1-18; for example, see Fig. 2, "API", on the SCU side; the

user is employing the constructed objects that provides the service. Therefore, the user is

employing the constructed service providing system.)

- an object system interface part for exchanging data between the object system

interface part and said object system in accordance with a predetermined protocol

("In the present invention, DICOM standard services are implemented by objects or o

methods which exist within a toolkit framework. In a preferred embodiment, the

framework is divided into application subsystems and internal subsystems. ...

Application subsystems provide a framework of objects mapped to an abstract form of

DICOM services. The application framework and associated mapping to DICOM

services provides an application interface to the toolkit framework. The application

interface simplifies creation of an application program which provides DICOM services

and conforms to DICOM protocol." in column 7, lines 49-63; the application interface is

interpreted as an object system interface part; see Fig. 3, item 25

"DTSERVICEINTERFACE".)

- an integrated control part for controlling said data holding part, said user

interface part and said object system interface part ("Handler objects (SCUs/SCPs)

enable an application to send and return calls to and from other applications ... A

SCU/SCP (service user handler/service provider handler) pair exists for each DICOM

user service. The SCU, service user handler initiates a DICOM message service request.

The SCP, service provider handler responds to the service request." in column 2, lines

43-50; Handler objects (SCUs/SCPs) are interpreted as an integrated control part for

controlling the DICOM service collection of objects, API, and application interface,

which are interpreted as data holding part, user interface part and object system interface

part, respectively. The DICOM service collection of objects is *not* the handler objects

(SCUs/SCPs). Each service object, when instantiated, is uniquely associated with a user

handler and a provider handler, see column 2, lines 5-9. Handler objects (SCUs/SCPs)

controls the DICOM service collection of objects that they are associated with, API, and

application interface by providing communication between the DICOM service collection

of objects, API, and application interface.)

- preparing a plurality of classes on the basis of each of said data holding part, said

user interface part, said object system interface part and said integrated control

part of said framework for service providing system; associating said classes with

each other; and defining a sequence carried out between the respective classes

wherein said object system interface part of said framework for service providing

system converts external data, which are exchanged between said object system

interface part and said object system, into a format of intermediate data which is

independent of said protocol, and said integrated control part of said framework for

service providing system converts said intermediate data into a format of internal

data which is handled in said service providing system, said data holding part and user interface part of said framework for service providing system handling said internal data which have been converted by said integrated control part ("Each service is functionally distributed among atomic service units, each unit representing the smallest portion of a service provided by the present invention. Each atomic unit is represented by a base class, from which service objects are derived ... A base class for handler object is provided from which an application subclasses to generate handler objects. Sub-classing enables an application to customize the actions taken by a service interface object. ... The outgoing message is called a "Request". The request is encoded 12 into a DICOM message. This involves two processes. First, the message is formulated into the DICOM Toolkit's own internal representation which we call an element list. Each individual attribute that together will compromise the message is represented in this list. The elements in the list then each in ram, dumped into packets specified by the DICOM protocol. The elements themselves, each know how to format themselves correctly. These packets are transmitted across a network 13 (ethernet, fddi, etc.) to a DICOM service provider. The incoming packets are decoded 14 by the service provider 15, and an element list that is identical to the one that was transmitted is created by the provider. The incoming message is called an "Indication". The decoding process determines the message type. This information is used to route the message to the correct DTProviderHandler." in column 57-67 to column 3, lines 1-4; column 8, lines 2-22).

Per Claim 2:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said integrated control part of said framework for service providing system controls data which are held in said data holding part, and connects said data holding part with said user interface part to provide various services for said object system on the basis of data which are given from said user or said object system (column 2, lines 43-50 and column 2, lines 64-67 to column 3, lines 1-15).

Per Claim 4:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said service providing system is a monitoring system for monitoring an external apparatus serving as said object system (column 1, lines 27-29 and column 2, lines 13-15).

Per Claim 5:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said service providing system is a control system for controlling a controlled apparatus serving as said object system (column 1, lines 27-29 and column 2, lines 10-21).

Per Claim 6:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said service providing system is an information system for exchanging information between the service providing system and an information system serving as said object system (column 2, lines 35-42).

Per Claim 7 (Amended, as best understood):

This is a system version of the claimed method discussed above (claims 1 and 2), wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Mason.

Per Claim 9 (Amended, as best understood):

This is a computer readable recording medium version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 7, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Mason.

Per Claim 11 (Amended, as best understood):

This is another version of the claimed computer readable recording medium discussed above, claim 9, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Mason.

Per Claim 12 (Amended, as best understood):

This is a computer readable recording medium version of the claimed system discussed above, claim 7, wherein all claim limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, this claim is also anticipated by Mason.

Per Claim 14:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein each of said data holding part, said object system interface part and said integrated control part includes a class which is prepared for every kind of object system, and said user interface part includes a class which is prepared for every kind of screens for interface (column 2, lines 57-67 to column 3, lines 1-15).

Per Claim 15:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said class included in said data holding part is prepared for every kind of data, which are used in said object systems, in addition to the kind of said object systems (column 2, lines 57-61).

Per Claim 16:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said class included in said integrated control part is prepared for every

kind of services, which are provided for said object systems, in addition to the kind

of said object systems (column 2, lines 64-67 to column 3, lines 1-4).

Per Claim 17:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein said class included in said integrated control part includes an upper class,

which is prepared for every kind of said object systems, and a lower class which is

prepared for every kind of services which are provided for said object systems

under said upper class (column 2, lines 64-67 to column 3, lines 1-4).

Per Claim 18:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein a class included in said integrated control part controls a class included in

said data holding part (column 2, lines 43-50 and column 2, lines 57-67 to column 3,

lines 1-4)

- a class included in said user interface part updates and refers to said class included

in said data holding part; data, which are given from said user and said object

system, are exchanged between said class included in said user interface part and

said class included in said integrated control part; and data, which relate to a

service provided for said object system, are exchanged between said class included

in said integrated control part and said class included in said object system interface

part (column 3, lines 5-15).

Per Claim 19:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein when service providing instructions for said object system are given to a

class included in a user interface part, said class included in said user interface part

reflects data, which relate to service providing instructions, in a class included in

said data holding part, and gives a class included in said integrated control part

notice of said service providing instructions (column 2, lines 35-50 and column 3, lines

5-15)

- said class included in said integrated control part acquires data of said class

included in said data holding part, and transmits data of said class, which is

included in said data holding part, to a class included in said object system interface

part, said class included in said object system interface part adding data, which

relate to a protocol, to data received from said integrated control part (column 2,

lines 64-67 to column 3, lines 1-4).

Per Claim 20:

The Mason patent discloses:

- wherein when service provided results from said object system are given to a class included in an object system interface part, said class included in said object system interface part deletes data, which relate to a protocol, from data received from said object system (column 8, lines 14-22)

- and gives a class, which is included in said integrated control part, notice of service provided results, said class included in said integrated control part reflecting data, which relate to service provided results, in a class included in said data holding part, and giving a class, which is included in said user interface, notice of service provided results, and said class included in said user interface part acquiring data, which relate to service provided results, from said class included in said data holding part (column 8, lines 34-67 to column 9, lines 1-18).

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

a)   In the Final Office Action dated October 22, 2003, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12, and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. j 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,668,998 ("Mason"). Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12 have been amended to further define and clarify the invention, and Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art in that it recites,

for example, the user interface part being placed on a boundary between a computer and

the user. Amended Claims 7, 9, 11, and 12 include similar recitations.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner states that the API in FIG. 2 of Mason

discloses a user interface part for receiving instructions from a user and for presenting

data to the user when the user employs the constructed service providing system, as

recited in independent Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12. Furthermore, in the Advisory Action, the

Examiner states that as previously pointed out in Paper No. 9, Mason teaches a user

interface part for receiving instructions from a user and for presenting data to the user

when the user employs the constructed service providing system (column 7, lines 64-67

to column 8, lines 1-3, column 8, lines 56-67 to column 9, lines 1-18', for example, see

Fig. 2, 'API", on the SCU side). In addition, the Examiner states that Mason's API on the

SCU side is interpreted as the user interface part where the application developer chooses

the DT Service Interface object to initiate a request via the API. Furthermore, according

to the Examiner, the application developer in Mason receives the status/confirmation of

the request. If the status was not a success in Mason, then the application developer,

according to the Examiner, needs to recover from this status, for example, by creating a

subclass of the appropriate DT Service Interface class.

While FIG. 2 may disclose an API, nowhere in Mason does it disclose the API

receiving and presenting data when the user employs the constructed service providing

system. Rather, Mason's API is merely an interface through which an application

programmer customizes individual objects in the framework or alters parameter values

and object behavior when developing the framework. Mason's API does not receive

instructions from a user or present data to the user when the user employs the constructed

service providing system. Accordingly, Mason's API toolkit framework does not disclose

the user interface part, as recited in independent Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12, which receives

instructions from a user and presents data to the user when the user employs the

constructed service providing system.

Examiner's response:

a)   Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Mason fails to

disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12. Mason clearly shows

each and every limitation in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12. As per amended claims 1, 7, 9, 11

and 12, the limitation "the user interface part being placed on a boundary between a

computer and the user" is interpreted as "the user interface part provides an interface

between a computer and the user"; see the rejection above in paragraph 7 for rejection

under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20.

Furthermore, Mason teaches a user interface part for receiving instructions from a

user and for presenting data to the user when the user employs the constructed service

providing system, the user interface part provides an interface between a computer and

the user (column 7, lines 64-67 to column 8, lines 1-3; column 8, lines 56-67 to column 9,

lines 1-18; for example, see Fig. 2, "API", on the SCU side; the user is employing the

constructed objects that provides the service. Therefore, the user is employing the

constructed service providing system.)

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 9 for rejection to claims 1, 7, 9,

11 and 12.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

b)   Furthermore, Mason's Fig. 2 merely discloses that the interface (e.g., the interface

for encoding / decoding image data) used by the handler objects (SCP/SCU) may be

defined as an Application Programmers Interface (API). This does not mean that Mason's

API is an interface placed on a boundary between a computer node and an end user (e.g.,

a person who employs the computer node). Instead, Mason's API corresponds to an

interface placed between a first computer node and a second computer node so that the

first computer may communicate image data with the second computer node through the

API.

In contrast, however, the claimed user interface part, for example, may be placed

on a boundary between a computer node and an end user (a person, for example, who

employs the computer node). This means that the claimed user interface part may, for

example, be an API for user-to-node, and may not be an API for node-to-node.

Moreover, in Mason's Fig. 2, the term "User" in "Service Class User (SCUI" is

merely used to contrast it with the term "Provider" in "Service Class Provider (SCP)."

Namely, both the SCU and the SCP are computer nodes, one of which (e.g., the SCU)

receives image data from the other computer node (e.g., the SCP), whereas the other of

which (e.g., the SCP) sends image data to the one computer node (e.g., the SCU). In other

words, the terms "User" and "Provider" merely represent the roles or behaviors of the

computer nodes connected via a network, and they may not represent end users who

employ the medical system constructed by the framework. In addition, the SCU is

incorporated into a middleware for communication, and may not exist inside an

application. see Mason, col. 8, lines 56-67 and col. 9, lines 1-18.)

In contrast, the claimed user, for example, may mean an end user who actually

employs the service providing system constructed by the framework. Moreover, the

claimed user interface part may, for example, receive instructions from an end user or

may display the status of the object system.

In summary, Mason's SCU merely decodes image data sent from the SCP and

transmits a message to the SCU. Mason's SCU does not include a user interface that is

placed on a boundary between a computer node and an end user.

Furthermore, Mason's API toolkit framework merely comprises an interface

through which an application programmer may select to create an application that

provides a particular DICOM service. (See Mason, col. 3, lines 16-21.) Mason's API

toolkit framework has nothing to do with either the SCU (as an API for node-to-node) or

the claimed user interface part (for example, an API for user-to-node).

Examiner's response:

b)   Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Mason fails to

disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12. Mason clearly shows

each and every limitation in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12. As per amended claims 1, 7, 9, 11

and 12, the limitation "the user interface part being placed on a boundary between a

computer and the user" is interpreted as "the user interface part provides an interface

between a computer and the user"; see the rejection above in paragraph 7 for rejection

under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to claims 1-2, 4-7, 9, 11-12 and 14-20.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., end user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 9 for rejection to claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

c)   In addition, the Examiner states in the Final Office Action that the handler object (SCP/SCU) of Mason discloses an integrated control pad for controlling said data holding part, said user interface pad and said object system interface pad, as recited in independent Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12, and for controlling said internal system means and said object system interface means, as recited in independent Claim 11. Mason, however, merely discloses that the SCP/SCU ensures that messages and events are in appropriate DICOM standard format. (See col. 2, lines 41-43.) Mason further discloses that the SCP/SCU enables an application to send and return calls from other applications. (See col. 2, lines 44-46.) Unlike the claimed integrated control part, Mason's SCP/SCU does not control anything, much less a data holding pad, a user interface pad, or an object system interface part, as recited in Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12, or an internal system means or an object system interface means, as recited in Claim 11.

Furthermore, Mason's handler objects (SCP/ SCU) merely enable an application to send and return calls to and from other applications. (See col. 2, lines 43-44.) This

means that Mason's handler objects (SCP/ SCU) are incorporated into a middleware for

communication, and thus do not exist inside an application.

Moreover, Mason's actual framework structure is completely different from the

Examiner's assertions that the handler objects (SCP/SCU) are an integrated control part

for controlling the DICOM service collection of objects. For example, although the

Examiner asserts that the DICOM service collection of objects corresponds to the

claimed holding part, the DICOM service collection of objects may simply correspond to

the handler objects (SCP/SCU) that accomplish DICOM services.

Also, although the Examiner asserts that the API corresponds to the claimed user

interface part, Mason's API is merely an interface placed between one computer node and

the other computer node, as described above. Accordingly, Mason's API has nothing to

do with the claimed user interface pad, which may be placed on a boundary between a

computer node and an end user.

In addition, although the Examiner asserts that the application interface

corresponds to the claimed object system interface part, the term "application interface"

may merely be a general expression of "API." According to Mason's Fig. 2, there is no

component called "application interface."

In this regard, even if the DICOM service collection of objects, API, and

application interface are interpreted as a data holding part, a user interface part, and an

object system interface part, respectively, the claimed invention is completely different

from Mason. For example, although the claimed invention, for example, may include that

the user interface pad "utilizes" the data holding part, Mason does not disclose the API

utilizing the DICOM service collection of objects. In addition, although the claimed

invention may include, for example, that the integrated control part and the object system

interface part utilize each other, Mason does not disclose that the handler objects

(SCP/SCU) and the application interface utilize each other.

In short, Mason does not disclose the above referenced recitations of independent

Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12. Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12

patentably distinguish the present invention over the cited art, and Applicant respectfully

requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12.

Examiner's response:

c)   Examiner strongly disagrees with applicant's assertion that Mason fails to

disclose the claimed limitations recited in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12. Mason clearly shows

each and every limitation in claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12.

Mason teaches an integrated control part for controlling said data holding part,

said user interface part and said object system interface part (column 2, lines 43-50;

Handler objects (SCUs/SCPs) are interpreted as an integrated control part for controlling

the DICOM service collection of objects, API, and application interface, which are

interpreted as data holding part, user interface part and object system interface part,

respectively. The DICOM service collection of objects is *not* the handler objects

(SCUs/SCPs). Each service object, when instantiated, is uniquely associated with a user

handler and a provider handler, see column 2, lines 5-9. Handler objects (SCUs/SCPs)

controls the DICOM service collection of objects that they are associated with, API, and

application interface by providing communication between the DICOM service collection

of objects, API, and application interface.)

Furthermore, the Examiner has already addressed the applicant's argument regarding "user interface part, which may be placed on a boundary between a computer node and an end user" in the Examiner's Response (b) above.

In addition, Mason teaches an object system interface part (column 7, lines 49-63; the application interface is interpreted as an object system interface part; see Fig. 3, item 25 "DTSERVICEINTERFACE".)

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., utilizes) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 9 for rejection to claims 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12.

In the remarks, the applicant argues that:

d)   Dependent Claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons above regarding independent Claims 1 and 12 and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20.

Examiner's response:

d)   The Examiner has already addressed the applicant's arguments regarding

independent claims 1, 7, 9, 11, and 12 in the Examiner's Responses (a)-(c) above. In

addition, see the rejection above in paragraph 9 for rejection to claims 2, 4-6, and 14-20.

Conclusion

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed

to Qamrun Nahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-7699. The examiner can

normally be reached on Mondays through Thursdays from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The

examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kakali Chaki, can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or processing is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QN
June 25, 2004

KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100